

Department of Elementary and Secondary Education
Special Education Monitoring Self-Assessment (SEMSA)

Report Summary

MSIP Year: 2001-2002

Total Number of Surveys:	Regional Professional Development Center (RPDC)			
Role of Person completing this survey:	Heart of Missouri-Columbia:	5	South Central Missouri:	4
Special Education Contact:	Southwest Missouri:	5	Southeast Missouri:	0
Superintendent:	Kansas City:	4	St. Louis:	1
Principal:	Northeast Missouri:	0	Central Missouri:	4
Other:	Northwest Missouri:	6		

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Not Sure	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
A. TRAINING/TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE					
1. SEMSA training workshops were helpful.	11	23	4	4	1
2. DESE provided timely and helpful responses to questions.	14	18	5	6	0
3. Compliance List Serv was helpful in answering questions.	7	20	15	1	0
B. WRITTEN INSTRUCTIONS					
4. SEMSA instruction guidelines were helpful.	7	23	6	5	2
5. SEMSA instruction guidelines were user friendly.	3	25	6	8	1
C. SELF-ASSESSMENT PROCESS					
6. Data required to complete the self-monitoring review was easily accessible.	4	27	3	8	1
7. Amount of time required to complete the review was reasonable.	2	14	5	14	8
8. Electronic submission of data is an efficient way to send SEMSA data to DESE.	16	11	14	2	0
9. SEMSA process increased understanding of compliance requirements for special education.	12	19	5	3	4
10. SEMSA process is an effective way to assess student performance for students w/ disabilities.	3	14	12	9	5
11. SEMSA process has made district/agency more aware of performance of students w/disabilities.	6	21	4	8	4
12. SEMSA process helped accurately evaluate performance of students w/ disabilities.	3	14	6	15	5
13. SEMSA process is an effective way to assess compliance with state/federal regulations.	12	23	4	2	2
14. Time spent on the SEMSA process was beneficial.	7	18	11	1	6
D. FINAL REPORT AND LETTER					
15. Received final monitoring report/letter in reasonable length of time.	4	14	1	10	14
16. Final report/letter were user friendly.	7	19	5	4	8
E. CORRECTIVE ACTION/IMPROVEMENT PLANNING					
17. District/agency is aware of its areas of non-compliance.	15	22	6	0	0
18. District/agency is aware of what it needs to do to correct any areas of non-compliance.	12	24	4	2	2
F. ON-SITE PREPARATION AND VISIT					
19. Preparation for the on-site monitoring accomplished in reasonable amount of time.	2	8	4	4	4
20. On-site monitoring was beneficial.	5	6	5	4	1
21. On-site monitoring conducted in an efficient and effective manner.	6	8	6	0	1
22. DESE staff conducting on-site monitoring were knowledgeable.	8	6	6	1	1
23. DESE staff conducting on-site monitoring were professional.	8	8	4	0	1
24. DESE staff conducting the on-site monitoring were helpful.	8	6	6	0	1

25. How many staff were involved in the SEMSA self-monitoring review process?

Special Educators: 621 Administrators: 248 Support Staff: 105 Others: 10

26. How many total hours did it take to complete the SEMSA Review and Reporting:

Less than 20 hours: 4 21 to 30 hours: 9 31 to 40 hours: 12 More than 40 hours: 17

27. Did staff request assistance from a DESE special education Compliance supervisor during the SEMSA process?

Yes 33 No 9

Questions 28-31 are addressed on a separate report.